IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

FRIDAY, THE 20TH JULY 2007 / 29TH ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 21468 of 2003(E)

PETITIONER:

C.N.VENUGOPALAN, DEEPANJALI,
KESARI JUNCTION, NORTH PARAVUR, KERALA
RETIRED ACCOUNTANT AT PANAMPILLY NAGAR,
KOCHI BRANCH UNION BANK OF INDIA.

BY ADV. SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. UNION BANK OF INDIA, CENTRAL OFFICE,
239, BACKBAY RECLAMATION, NARIMAN POINT,
MUMBAI-400 O21, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN &
MANAGING DIRECTOR.

2. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF FINANCE, NEW DELHI.

BY ADV. SRI.A.S.P.KURUP, SC, UBI (R1)
ADV. SRI.THOMAS MATHEW NELLIMOOTTIL FOR R2

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 20/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C) NO: 21468/2003 E

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1. COPY OF THE VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT SCHEME CIRCULATED BY STAFF CIRCULAR DT. 7/11/00 OF THE R1.

EXT.P2. COPY OF THE LETTER DT. 17/7/2002 BY THE R1 TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P3. COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DT. 7/4/03 FROM THE PETITIONER TO THE R1.

EXT.P4. COPY OF THE LETTER DT. 12/5/03 FROM THE R1 TO THE PETITIONER.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS **NIL**

True copy

tga

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,J

W.P.(C)NO.21468 of 2003

Dated this the 20th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner who was an officer of the first respondent bank opted to retire from service under Ext.P1 voluntary retirement scheme. After receiving the benefits under Ext.P1, the petitioner raised claim demanding certain benefits available under the Union Bank of India (Officers) service Regulations on retirement. He has also a case that even the full amount as payable to him under Ext.P1 scheme have not been released. The first claim of the petitioner is covered against him by the Division Bench decision of this Court in **Kurup v Union Bank of India** (2006(3) KLT 265). Regarding the second claim the respondents have filed a counter affidavit stating that all amounts due have been correctly computed and paid. A total amount of Rs.25,11,591.92 was paid to him, it is submitted. The petitioner has not filed any reply affidavit disputing the said claim. In view

of the above position, no relief could be granted to the petitioner. Accordingly,the writ petition is dismissed.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
JUDGE

CSS